1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

612 [426] but repayment after a reasonable interval is expected, and in almost all cases is met, even where it leads to the sale of sheep. It amounts to this, that a man will help his kinsman and indeed is morally obliged to do so, so long as this assistance does not conflict with the interests of his own family.

Again, money may be loaned between kinsmen

2. THE KINDRED

[411] The kindred of the Sarakatsani has three important formal characteristics. It is bilateral, the limits of its extension are precisely defined, and within these limits a man may not marry.

There is a sense in which almost all kinship systems may be described as bilateral, or to speak more accurately, filiation is normally bilateral and complementary.[4] But in describing the Sarakatsan kindred as bilateral it is my intention also to suggest a certain, though not exact, symmetry in the relations of a man to the family of origin[5] of his father on the one hand, and to the family of origin of his mother on the other; and to indicate further that, in principle, a man has equivalent confidence in, and similar rights over and obligations towards, more distant collateral kinsmen such as first or second cousins, whether the relationships with these persons are traced through the father or through the mother.[6] There is always a very strong moral obligation to assist any collateral kinsman. For instance, it often

[113] [4] Meyer Fortes, 'Structure of Unilineal Descent Groups', *American Anthropologist*, 1953, vol. 55, p. 33.

[5] This is Lloyd Warner's familiar distinction between the family of orientation and the family of procreation. I prefer the terms 'origin' and 'marriage'; in the family of origin the individual is a child and a sibling, in the family of marriage a spouse and a parent.

[101] [6] The bilateral form of the kindred is plainly reflected in the terminology. The word σόι, kindred, applies, of course, to both maternal and paternal relations; and the words for kinsman συγγενής and relationship συγγένεια are both used in the same way. The terms which are used to describe kinship relationship outside the family do not differentiate between maternal and paternal kinsmen. Thus the term θεῖος, uncle, is used for both mother's brother and father's brother as well as for all male first cousins of both parents whether these are connected through male or female links. The same may be said about the other terms for παππούλης, grandfather, γιάγια, grandmother, θεία, aunt, ξάδερφος, ξαδέρφη, male and female cousin, ανεψιός, ανεψιά, nephew and niece, and έγγονι, έγγονή, grandchild, grand-daughter.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

its members.[9] It is only through the marriages of their grandparents and parents that a man and his siblings are related to the four component groups of collaterals in his kindred. Kindred relations are personal, not corporate, relations. And the Sarakatsan kindred in no way acts as a property-holding group since, besides the fact that it is relative to a particular sibling group, it has no continuity from generation to generation.

In drawing attention to this bilateral and symmetrical form of the kindred I have been careful to avoid speaking of bilateral descent. In anthropological writings principles of descent normally refer to rules which determine membership in corporate lineal descent groups. Such groups are bodies of kinsmen whose members may be recruited through filiation to a line of descent exclusively through males (patrilineal), or exclusively through females (matrilineal).[10] Descent from a common ancestor or group of ancestors defines membership in the group and identifies the interests of its members, which may concern political and ritual rights and obligations as well as inheritance and succession. It is possible to talk of a corporate bilateral descent group where membership depends upon filiation through both parents but in such an instance the group would have to practise obligatory endogamous marriage. But the Sarakatsan kindred is not an endogamous group. Corporate descent groups imply a principle of perpetual succession, a feature which the kindred entirely lacks; and they also imply that individuals have categorical rights and obligations outside the elementary or extended family, whereas in the Sarakatsan kindred this is not so. Not descent, but filiation of a man or woman to his or her family of origin is the factor which

[9] Any two kinsmen other than siblings have kindreds which to a greater or lesser degree overlap. A man may find himself in a situation where two men, both related to him but unrelated to one another, are in some form of conflict in which both appeal to him for support. In this predicament the only solution is to remain neutral, since it would be sinful to act against a kinsman except under great provocation. But generally such a situation extends rather than restricts the range of kinship obligations; towards a person who, although not a kinsman himself, is closely related to a kinsman, a man ought to act with more consideration and less hostility than is usual between men who are unrelated.

[10] There are other possibilities, viz. bilineal or dual descent, parallel descent, and alternating descent.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

611 determines status, categorical rights and obligations, and mem-
612 bership in the family group, which is the only solidary kin grouping in this system of kinship and marriage. Hence in a description of the Sarakatsan kindred it seems preferable not to speak, even loosely, of any principle of descent.[11]

It is true that the kindred of any man includes the descendants of four pairs of great-grandparents. It is, therefore, possible to represent the kindred diagrammatically as four interlock-
[129] ing pyramids of cognatic descent. But this kind of abstraction bears no relation to the mental image which a Sarakatsanos forms of his kindred, in which relations are conceived in terms of extension from the family of origin, not descent from a common ancestor. There is mutual affection and moral obligation between my second cousin and myself because my grandparent and his grandparent were siblings rather than because we are both descendants of common great-grandparents. I prefer, then, to speak of equivalent bilateral extension, for this describes precisely the constitution of the kindred. The qualification of bilateral extension by the notion of equivalence is intended to underline both the fact that collateral kinsmen are recognized to the degree of second cousin on either side of the family, and also the equipotential character of matrilateral and patrilateral relationships.

612 The second formal characteristic of the kindred is the definition of its limits, which, in this case, are drawn in a man's own generation at the collateral degree of second cousin, a span of collateral kinship which is calculated by recognizing as kinsmen the descendants of his four grandparents and their siblings. Thereafter, as we have seen, the recognition of collaterals is increasingly restricted in descendant generations. This limitation, considered together with equivalent bilateral extension, leads to a simple process within the kindred whereby the range of collateral relationship which a child may inherit from either
[582] parent is severely delimited. The second cousins of his parent are not, in a formal sense, a man's kinsmen and, therefore, he may marry a kinswoman of this degree.

[113] [11] In some general remarks about the concept of descent in bilateral systems Professor Firth has adopted a similar viewpoint. Raymond Firth (editor), *Two Studies of Kinship in London*, London, 1956, p. 15. Cf. also W. H. R. Rivers, *Social Organisation*, London, 1924, p. 86, and G. P. Murdock, *Social Structure*, New York, 1949, p. 15.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

siblings and collaterals the two principles are opposed, sibling solidarity being the source and justification of relationship and moral obligation between collaterals, while parental obligation is the principle which, within the limits of a bilateral kindred, isolates the family from other kinsmen and their families. At the risk of some repetition, and in summary form, the critical aspects of these relationships are: (1) before marriage siblings are bound to one another by categorical obligations; (2) after marriage, the purpose of which is the begetting of children, this nexus is gradually dissolved; (3) after marriage the supreme value in a man's life becomes the welfare of his children; (4) parenthood forces a man for the sake of his children to cultivate his affines; this weakens to some extent the relationship with his siblings; (5) brothers after living together for a few years after marriage as a united extended family divide the common flock and the common household; after partition brothers generally continue to co-operate in the management of their sheep, but on a basis of strict accountancy; (6) collateral kinship is conceived by the Sarakatsani themselves as an extension from the family of origin which relates kinsmen to an original pair of siblings; thus collaterals see themselves as united by derivation from a once united sibling group but divided as a result of the marriages contracted by the members of that group and their children.

I must now introduce a consideration which to some small extent qualifies the symmetry which I have claimed to be a feature of the bilateral kindred. The absence of a unilineal principle of descent grouping does not prevent the Sarakatsani from having a very strong sentimental interest in their patriline and a formal preference for those kinsmen who are related through the father, especially those who bear the same name. The cousins with whom a man often shares his early childhood years in an extended family are agnatic cousins. And while the obligation to carry out blood vengeance does not extend beyond the elementary family, it is significant that when a man voluntarily avenges a kinsman beyond this narrow circle it is almost always an agnatic first cousin. Yet it must be said again that outside the elementary family moral obligations to kinsmen of the same collateral degree are the same however the relationship is mediated. The man, who states categorically that 'we

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

prefer relatives through the father', may name a maternal cousin as his most trusted friend.

When a Sarakatsanos talks loosely of his 'fathers and forefathers', he is probably thinking of a vague body of ancestors in the agnatic line. But in fact a man seldom knows very much about his direct ancestors in any line beyond the generation of his grandparents unless they have some claim to particular fame or infamy. Ascendant kinsmen are only relevant as individual personalities to the extent that they affect the inheritance of physical and moral attributes and social prestige. And it is the families of origin of the man's parents, presided over by his four grandparents, which essentially affect his social standing. The lines of descent from the two pairs of grandparents are the kinship co-ordinates, as it were, which intersect and define the unique position of a group of siblings within the community. Naturally the preference for the kinsmen of the father implies that in this evaluation the qualities of paternal kin have more weight, but this is not to be confused with the presence of a patrilineal descent principle.

A man is more interested in his sons than in his daughters simply because they are males and not because they are specifically agnatic links ensuring continuity in an exclusively agnatic descent line. It is important to a man to beget male children because in so doing he accentuates his own masculinity, extended in time. A man wants sons 'so that his name will be heard' (νὰ ἀκούεται τ'ὄνομά του), not simply the surname which is inherited patrilineally, but for it to be said that this is George Carvounis son of John Carvounis. Sons bring prestige, daughters do not. When the husband enters the hut for the first time after the birth of a daughter, his wife turns her head away and lowers her eyes in shame.

This formal preference for the father's kinsmen is consistent with, and indeed is, in the area of kinship, a reflection of the greater value placed upon the male sex. This is a fundamental value of Greek culture, whose essential masculinity can be remarked at all stages in its development from Homeric times until the present day. Thus, in the Sarakatsan community it is the behaviour of the ideal man that provides the dominant value patterns of honour and pride. The sexes divide the community into opposite yet complementary categories, categories

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

always known in the neighbourhood when a family has had guests (μουσαφίρηδες); their quality, relationship, and the possible reasons for their visit are debated in detail by the other families. Comment is often caustic, but the very interest which is aroused is a recognition of the importance of the event. If a family of numbers and wealth entertains a patron from the town, this is a triumph which it enjoys to the full. Meat is killed and wine is bought. Largesse is demanded of the family which entertains many guests. And in some mysterious way neighbouring families discover the measure of generosity, or meanness, which a host has shown to his visitors; and criticism, encouraged by envy, will not spare him. In hospitality (φιλοξενία), a virtue in which the Sarakatsani believe they are naturally pre-eminent, there is always a strong element of competition.

(c) LINEAGE[1]

Νταμάρι, lineage, refers to the quality of the kindred relationships which a man inherits from both his father and mother; and the importance of this for prestige has already been discussed in chapter three. If he possesses the surname of one of the leading families, or is directly descended, preferably in the male line, from a famous tselingas of the last century, this also is a significant element in a man's reputation. It might appear to indicate that for the highest and the lowest families, at least, reputation of lineage is patrilineally inherited. There is, indeed, a bias in favour of relationships traced through the father (particularly agnatic relationships) in the evaluation of νταμάρι in all families, and this is certainly accentuated at either extreme of the hierarchy of prestige, where certain family names are associated with the idea of high or low reputation, but the inheritance of νταμάρι remains fundamentally bilateral. In general, as we shall see in a discussion of marriage, men are careful to marry their sons or daughters into families of equal reputation. Where a member of a leading family takes a bride of markedly lower lineage, the community withdraws from the new family the recognition of the prestige associated with the husband's surname by the simple procedure of refusing to call

[1] Lineage, here, does not, of course, refer to a unilineal descent group but to the quality of pedigree through all lines of descent.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

him by this name, and substituting some nickname, or patronymic.

But the prestige of lineage depends itself on the attributes of wealth and numbers which have already been examined. It does not help a poor man to claim that his great-grandfather was a famous tselingas with two thousand sheep. It is true that a father, or grandfather, who had the necessary wealth to support the nobility of his line is a saving grace for those who have lost their flocks, but it is a small one. The children of a leading family whose wealth has vanished suffer the same fate as the children of a family whose father, although from a family of the 'first lineage', has married beneath himself, that is they literally 'lose' their name, the surname of the father. Lineage refers to prestige in the past, while the essence of competition in this community is concerned with influence in the present. Therefore, a 'name', without the means to support it, is not recognized.

This, in practice, is the mechanism that restricts the number of families that can successfully claim to be of 'first lineage'. Not all the collateral relatives of a leading family are recognized as equivalent in prestige, for without numbers and wealth they cannot aspire to this. And it is inherently unlikely that they will all possess these advantages. There are two important limiting factors. With the rule of equal inheritance between brothers, the size of the group of brothers which is necessary to build and protect wealth and prestige, itself is the cause, in the next generation, of the fragmentation of this wealth. The second factor is disease. Twenty years ago sheep-pox, and today liver-fluke, are diseases capable of decimating a flock within a short time. However honourable a man, the loss of his flocks must diminish his own prestige to some degree, and that of his children more seriously.

(D) MARRIAGES

Τὸ συμπεθεριό is the affinal relationship between two previously unrelated families. It is in the early days of summer that the families of men who wish to take wives in the following year begin to consider the question of finding suitable affines and, during these weeks, the gossip of the community is much concerned with news and speculation about matchmaking.